MR. CHAIRMAN: But the Minister promised to send it. He does not have it with him now.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: I will send it.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: It arises out of this. He should have the numbers. How can he not have the information which is related to the main question?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, to my mind, so far as the surplus labour in ECL and BCCL is concerned, it is affecting. But the total number is not with me. I will inform the hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 85. I am clubbing it with Question No. 97 which is also on the same subject.

Decontrol of Sugar

†*85. SHRI SOM PAL
MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE :

Will the Minister of FOOD be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Indian Sugar Mills Association has currently been lobbying for decontrol of sugar and has been approaching Government for the purpose.

(b) if so, whether the Indian Sugar Mills Association is seeking decontrol of sugar prices and distribution only or even delicensing of the industry; and

(c) what is the reaction of Government in this regard and by when it is going to take decision?

THE MINISTER OF FOOD (SHRI AJIT SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Indian Sugar Mills Association has made representations from time to time wherein they have recommended to Government a policy of decontrol of sugar prices alongwith automatically in sugar releases.

The stand of the Indian Sugar Mills Association in respect of licensing is that expansion of capacity should be de-licensed. However, in regard to new units they have expressed certain reservations.

(c) For the present, the Govt. intends to continue the existing policy of partial control with a dual pricing system.

As regards delicening of the sugar industry, the present licensing policy, including the option of delicensing, is being reviewed by the Government.

Production and demand of Sugar

*97. HSHRI VIREN J. SHAH:†
SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN:

Will the Minister of FOOD be pleased to state:

(a) what is the estimated production and demand of sugar during the year 1995-96 and also the production and demand in 1993-94 and 1994-95;

(b) what steps Government have taken to ensure the normal production and availability of sugar to consumers at reasonable prices;

(c) whether there is any proposal to decontrol sugar; if so, what are the details and the present position in this regard;

(d) whether Government have examined the recommendations of the Gian Prakash Committee Report on sugar import scandal; if so, what are the details thereof, what has been the extent of loss caused to exchequer due to non-coordination of Government Departments resulting in delay in the import of sugar and rise in its prices;

(e) what action Government have taken against each of the persons in the Ministry of Food, Food Corporation of India, STC, etc. found responsible for delay in import of sugar and losses caused to the exchequer; and

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Sompal.

Question Nos. 85 and 97 were discussed together.

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Viren J. Shah.

Question Nos. 85 and 97 were discussed together.

(f) what remedial steps Government have taken in this regard to check the recurrence of such a situation in future?

THE MINISTER OF FOOD (SHRI AJIT SINGH): (a) to (f) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) Since sugar industry is an Agro based industry, it is too early to estimate the production and demand for the year 1995-96.

The production and consumption of sugar for the sugar years 1993-94 and 1994-95 are as under:—

(In lakh tonnes)

Sugar Year	Production	Internal Consumption
1993-94 (Prov.)	98.12	111.37
1994-95 (Esti.)	120.00	117 93

(b) The measures taken/initiated by the Government in this regard are given at Statement-I. (*See* below).

(c) At present, there is no proposal under consideration of the Government to change the existing policy of partial control on the distribution of sugar.

(d) to (f) The report submitted by Shri Gian Prakash, former Comptroller and Auditor General, has been placed in the Parliament Library. There is a reference in the report to the delay in the decision to import having been responsible for higher prices. as with loss of time imports were made at higher prices. While the administrative implications for this have been gone into, the report does not mention any matter that would create any suspicion of malafides on the part of anyone.

As regards the administrative remedial measures recommended by Shri Gian Prakash, they have been examined by a Committee of Secretaries under the Chairmanship of Cabinet Secretary. The Committee has since submitted its report.

Statement I

The Government have taken/initiated the following measures in order to give a boost to the sugar production and ensure its adequate availability to the consumers:—

(i) Early-crushing incentives have been announced in the form of higher freesale quota at 72 per cent as against the normal entitlement of 60 per cent to sugar mills for the productive achieved during the early crushing period (1.10-1994 to 15.11.1994) of 1994-95 season.

(ii) The Statutory Minimum Price (SMP) of sugarcane for 1994-95 season has been raised to Rs. 39.10 per quintal linked to the basic recovery of 8.5 per cent subject to a premium of Rs. 0.46 for every 0.1 per cent point increase in the recovery above that level upto 10 pr cent and Rs. 0.60 for every 0.1 per cent point increase in the recovery above 10 per cent.

(iii) An advance announcement of SMP for 1995-96 season has also been made at Rs. 42.50 per quintal linked to a basic recovery of 8.5 per cent, subject to premium for higher recoveries.

(iv) The release mechanism is regulated in a judicious manner in order to maintain the price of sugar in the open market at reasonable levels to the consumer as well as to enable the producers to pay remunerative cane price to the growers.

(v) The sugar factories are required to sell and despatch their monthly free sale quota in a regulated manner.

(vi) Restrictions have been placed on sugar dealers regarding stock holding limits, turn-over period, sale by one wholesaler to another etc to ensure that there is no hoarding of sugar by trade.

श्री सोम पाल : सभापति महोदय, पिछले तीन साल से जब भी मैं चीनी

मिल को डी-लाइसेंसिंग करने की नीति के संबंध में प्रश्न पूछता हूं तो एक ही उत्तर आता है कि सरकार उस पर विचार कर रही है, उसको रिव्यू कर रही है। आज भी वही घिसा-पिटा जवाब माननीय चौधरी अजित सिंह जी ने इस सदन में दे दिया। मुझे उनसे यह अपेक्षा नहीं थी क्योंकि इन्होंने राजनीति में आकर चौधरी चरण सिंह जी की विरासत संभालने का दावा किया था और संभाल बैठे हैं कल्पनाथ राय जी की। उसी राह पर चल रहे हैं यह आशंका मुझे हो रही है। तथ्य यह है कि देश में जितना भी गन्ना पैदा होता है उसका 50 प्रतिशत के करीब चीनी मिलों पर जाता है और शेष 50 प्रतिशत खंडसारी पर जाता है। यह भी तथ्य है कि खंडसारी की साढ़े छः प्रतिशत रिकवरी है और मिलों में 10 से 11 प्रतिशत रिकवरी है। इससे राष्ट्र को बहुत बड़ी हानि हो रही है। वेस्ट और बाई-प्रोडेक्ट यूटीलाइजेशन खंडसारी सेक्टर में बिल्कुल नहीं है जबकि मिलों में इसका शतप्रतिशत यूटीलाइजेशन होता है, उपयोग होता है। एक तो इससे राष्ट्र को हानि हो रही है और दूसरे किसान को भी हानि हो रही है क्योंकि उसको दाम नहीं मिलते। उसे मिल-मालिकों की दया पर निर्भर रहना पड़ता है क्योंकि यह बायर्स मार्किट रहा है सदा से, सप्लायर की मार्किट नहीं रही है। तीसरे चीनी की गुणवत्ता और उससे बनने वाले उत्पाद आदि से भी देश वंचित रहता है। यह सब होते हुये भी और जब सब उद्योगों के प्रति उदारीकरण की नीति बरती जा रही है तो कृषि पर आधारित इस महत्वपूर्ण उद्योग को उदारीकृत क्यों नहीं किया? इसका क्या कारण है? दूसरे खंडसारी जैसे उद्योग में वैक्यूम पेन जैसी आधुनिक टेक्नोलोजी की अनुमति क्यों नहीं दे रहे हैं। इसका क्या कारण है? तीसरे रिव्यू कब तक समाप्त करके निर्णय लेंगे? यह क, ख, ग तीनों प्रश्नों का जवाब देने की कृपा करें।

SHRI AJIT SINGH: Sir, the question is about licensing. So, the comments the hon. Member made before that are irrelevant.

(*Interruptions*)

श्री सोम पाल : मैं अपेक्षा करूंगा कि हिन्दी में उत्तर आये क्योंकि इसे पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश का किसान भी सुनना चाहता है। यह कम्प्यूटराइज्ड जवाब है अमेरिका का, हिन्दी में जवाब दीजिये।

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I also want the answer. Let him answer in English. How can he force the Minister? It is not a matter only for him. It is for all of us.

SHRI SOM PAL: Madam. I requested the Minister through the Chairman. You don't have a licence to intervene.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I leave it to the Minister. He can answer in any language. (*Interruptions*) Will you please sit down? (*Interruptions*) Please do sit down. I want you to sit down. The Minister will answer in whatever language he wishes.

SHRI AJIT SINGH: Sir, the question is about licensing of sugar industry. The main question is about that. There are two main associations which are involved in the sugar industry. One is the ISMA which represents the private sugar mill-owners, and the other is the co-opreative sector which contributes about 60 per cent of the total sugar production. Now, there are different view-points on this. Even the I.S.M.A., which is a private sugar mill owners' association, has been changing its views. Therefore, from the industry as such there is no unanimous demand, as the hon. Member is saying, that it should be delicensed. In 1992, the I.S.M.A. had said that they wanted...

श्री सोम पाल : सभापति महोदय, मैं हिन्दी में जवाब चाहता था।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not interrupt the Minister.

श्री अजीत सिंह : सोमपाल जी हिन्दी अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं वे अंग्रेजी भी अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं । वैसे वे ईयर फोन को कान में लगाकर वह जिस भाषा में सुनना चाहते हैं, सुन सकते हैं ।

श्री सोमपाल : अंग्रेजी किसान नहीं जानते हैं ।

श्री अजीत सिंह : किसान अखबार में पढ़ेगा । हिन्दी के अखबार में हिन्दी में पढ़ेगा और अंग्रेजी के अखबार में अंग्रेजी में पढ़ेगा । किसान यहां की बात नहीं सुन रहा है । जो मैं यहां कह रहा हूं वह उसको पढ़ लेगा और वे मेरी राय अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। आपकी जो चिंता किसानों के बारे में है वह मैं समझ रहा हूं लेकिन मुझे भी इसमें आपसे कम चिंता नहीं है ।

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी : आपकी चिंता सोमपाल जी को है ।

SHRI AJIT SINGH: Sir, the sugar industry is an agro-based industry. It is not like any other industry because its raw material is controlled by the Government. The area of cane is determined by the Government. The irrigation facilities and other things are given by the State Governments. Therefore, it is not just a question of licensing or delicensing because its repercussions would be there on the farmers also.

As I said, there are different views in the industry. The I.S.M.A. is not completely for delicensing. Their latest position is that they want to continue with the 25 kms. distance, but they want to do away with licensing in the expansion area. On the other hand, the co-operative sugar mills are very definite. They do not want any delicensing. They raise their share capital from the area allowed for their mills. If it is delicensed, they cannot raise their share capital because the farmers would not be inclined to contribute to one particular mill's share capital.

Therefore, Sir, the Government is considering all these things. Mr. Som Pal wants to know as to when we would announce our policy. I can assure him that we would do it soon. Give me some time.

श्री सोमपाल : दूसरा सवाल सभापति महोदय, मंत्री जी के इस उत्तर से संबंधित है, जो इन्होंने सहकारी मिलों के संबंध में कहा । जितनी भी सहकारी मिलें उत्तर प्रदेश में हैं सबका प्रबंध सरकारी अधिकारियों के हाथ में है जबकि शेयर पूंजी इसके लिये किसानों ने दी है । तो क्या कारण है कि सरकारी अधिकारी इसका प्रबंध कर रहे हैं? जो किसान हैं, जिन्होंने शेयर पूंजी दी है, उनको इनका प्रबंध क्यों नहीं दिया गया, एक तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं ।

दूसरा यह है कि सहकारी मिलों द्वारा और निजी मिलों द्वारा भी किसानों को भुगतान प्रायः बिलंब से किया जाता है । केन्द्रीय सरकार ने एक कानून पारित करके यह प्रावधान कर रखा है कि अगर विलंब से भुगतान होता है तो उसके ऊपर ब्याज दिया जायेगा और अगर यह ब्याज नहीं दिया जाता है तो उन मिलों को दंडित किया जायेगा । लेकिन आज तक किसी मिल को दंडित नहीं किया गया ।

तीसरा यह है कि जो किसान मिलों के नजदीक हैं उनको कीमत ज्यादा मिलती है और जो दूर हैं उनको कीमत कम मिलती है । जब कि ट्रांसपोर्ट कास्ट ईक्वलाइजेशन की पालिसी के ऊपर सरकार ने पहले से कमिटमेंट कर रखा है । तो इन तीनों बिन्दुओं के ऊपर मंत्री जी क्या कहना चाहते हैं ?

श्री अजित सिंह : माननीय सभापति जी, सहकारिता कानून प्रदेश सरकारों के अंडर में है । महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात में सहकारी मिलें ठीक से चल रही हैं । उत्तर प्रदेश में सहकारिता कानून में जो कमियां हैं, उनका जवाब उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ही दे सकती है ।

दूसरा सवाल आपका था कि . . .

श्री सोमपाल : भुगतान में जो बिलंब होता है उसके ऊपर ब्याज नहीं दिया जाता है । केन्द्र सरकार के कानून के तहत इसके लिये जो दंड का प्रावधान है उसके अन्तर्गत आज तक किसी को दंडित नही किया गया ।

श्री अजीत सिंह : ऐसा नहीं है कि दंडित न किया हो ।

श्री सोमपाल : कोई भी एक घटना बतायेंगे?

श्री अजीत सिंह : सोमपाल जी, आपको याद होगा कि उत्तर प्रदेश के मेरठ और गाजियाबाद जिलों में मिल-मालिकों को गिरफ्तार करने के भी आर्डर उस समय की सरकार ने दिये थे । वैसे यह कानून भी पूरा केन्द्र का नहीं है । इसका इंपलीमेंटेशन भी प्रदेश सरकार के हाथ में है । लेकिन यह समस्या उठ रही है और पिछले हफ्ते ही मैंने देखा कि कितने एरियर्स है । मैं प्रदेश सरकार को लिख रहा हूं कि कानून के जरिये वे इस पर ऐक्शन लें ।

श्री सोमपाल : ट्रांसपोर्ट कास्ट इक्वेलाइजेशन . . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Miss Saroj Khaparde. She is not here.

SHRI SOM PAL: Sir, the hon. Minister has not answered my question in regard to transport cost equalisation and. .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing you any more. Please sit down. Shri Viren Shah, please.

SHRI SOM PAL: I want an answer for the question which I had already asked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two questions.

SHRI SOM PAL: I am not raising any fresh question, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you kindly sit down? I have allowed you several interruptions.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: They were all irrelevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Viren Shah.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Sir, the statement mentions—in which part (c) of the question was partly replied to—that there is no proposal under consideration of the Government to change the existing policy of partial control. Perhaps, the hon. Minister was not a Minister then. So I want to remind him that six or eight months back, in this very House, the hon. Prime Minister made a statement while replying to a similar question, in which he stated that decontrol of sugar also has certain plus points; also there are certain other aspects; we are examining, and whatever is thought right we would be considering and willing to do. While the hon. Minister says that there is no proposal under consideration, I would like to know from him whether he has taken into account what the hon. Prime Minister had said or if he was informed about it.

SHRI AJIT SINGH: Sir, there are two things. One is decontrol of sugar and the other is delicensing. The hon. Member is confusing the issues. The question was about decontrol of sugar. Decontrol refers to the dual pricing where we supply PDS sugar at a lower cost. The question was about decontrol. About licensing I have already answered Mr. Som Pal. The same answer stands.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: In what you answered to the hon. Mr. Som Pal, you referred to delicensing and, in that context, because both the questions are

clubbed, I made a statement whether the hon. Minister has been made aware of the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister in this very House that it is being examined. What is the position in that context and how long would it take?

SHRI AJIT SINGH: Sir, as I have already said, the question of delicensing or continuing the licensing is being considered, and I have also pointed out both the pros and cons. The Prime Minister had basically said that on the question of delicensing, both pros and cons are there and Government was considering what to do about it. As far as decontrol is concerned, we have no intention of doing away with the dual pricing system.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Sir, in reply to (d), (e) and (f) which refers to the Gian Prakash Committee report, if you would kindly read part (d) of the question, it says, "what has been the extent of loss caused to the exchequer due to non-coordination of Government departments resulting in delay?" That is not replied. He has not replied about the loss caused to the exchequer. Would he be kind enough to indicate the amount? By now the loss caused to the exchequer must have been quantified. That is part one of my question. In that very reply the hon. Minister has mentioned that the report does not mention any matter that would create any suspicion of *mala fides* on the part of anyone. If I remember rightly, the report very clearly says—Mr. Gian Prakash has mentioned—that he was not asked to look into that. That does not give an alibi to the Government. Or, does it give an alibi to the Government? My question is whether there is no *mala fide* and you are satisfied with that. Because it is a categorical statement that he was not asked to examine it, there is no question of checking anything. Would the Minister kindly enlighten us?

SHRI AJIT SINGH: As the Gain Prakash Committee report has said and as the Prime Minister also replied to the debate on that, there was no *mala fi* raised in that report. The Gian Pr *kash Committee was asked to look in* certain things like what went wrong, wl the system did not function properl Therefore, that report is there.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: My subm sion is, I asked whether it was categor cally stated by Mr. Gian Prakash th he was not asked to inquire into it ar hence he has not inquired. Is that s

SHRI AJIT SINGH: That I will hav to see.

SHRI MD. SALIM: The Prime Mi ister had not replied to that, Sir.

...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I the proceedings of the other House.

..*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V.NARAYANASAMY: It ha not happened. That also you shoul understand.

SHRI AJIT SINGH: Sir, I will chec up the exact position and answer wha were the exact terms of reference of th Gian Prakash Committee and I wi reply to him. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: I am sorr Sir, my question was very specific Would you permit the Minister to clair ignorance about the question which very specific on the Gian Prakash Com mittee report and his stating that h would look into it and answer it? He ha been in this position for quite some time now. I seek your protection, Sir You might advise the Minister to repl to both the questions that. I have raised

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, hav you got an answer to that?

SHRI AJIT SINGH: Sir, I will supply the answer to the hon. Member.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: He is no prepared for that.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It is extremely unfortunate. The hon. Minister might have assumed office recently as a reward for his activities, but he should come to the House prepared.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, all these remarks are unnecessary.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: Sir, there is notice. How many days' notice did he get? Notice is of fifteen days minimum, and the Minister cannot claim that the question which is very specific, does not arise from this.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, there has to be a direction from the Chair. We solicit your direction on this issue on the Minister's failure to answer the question.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: The Minister has said that he would supply the information.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: The whole House should be concerned about it. It is a matter of the whole House.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I solicit intervention to protect the rights of the Members because if the ministers do not reply, that constitutes an infringement of the rights of the Members to seek information from the Ministers. There has to be a direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. I think the minister ought to have an answer with him. I wish at least from the Official Gallery they had given him an answer. I think it would not have been possible for those who have been working on this to give the Minister some help on this. Anyway, the Minister being new' is for the first time answering the questions.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: No, Sir' he is not new.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no, please I have expressed my view. He should have had an answer with him. Now he may send the answer to the Member.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: The first part is whether he is awake that Mr. Gian Prakash has specifically and categorically stated that he was not asked to inquire into the *mala fides*. He is taking shelter under the Gian Prakash Committee Report. He says that it does not mention any matter. Would that be proper? Is he aware that Mr. Gian Prakash has specifically said so, and, if so, why does he give this answer?

SHRI AJIT SINGH: The specific question is not what the ttrms of reference were. It only asks whether the Government has examined the recommendations, what its details are, what loss has been caused and what action has been taken by the Government.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: In your reply why are you stating that it does not mention any mtater that would create any suspicion of *mala fides*?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please. I have to go through the list.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: When he has mentioned in his reply about *mala fides* and Gian Prakash, I think, he is bound to refer to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you kindly sit down? Mr. Minister, shall be postpone this question to another day?

SHRI AJIT SINGH: Yes, Sir.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: It should be the first question on that day. Sir, would you kindly direct that it should be the first question on that day?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, yes. All right. We are postponing this question to the 24th.

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: We do certainly hope that he would come better prepared.